The Silent Controversy: Gain-of-Function Research and the Disbanding of MIT's Department of Applied Biological Sciences

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

October 3, 2023

In the annals of scientific research, few endeavors have been as simultaneously promising and perilous as gain-of-function (GoF) experiments. By empowering pathogens with new abilities, scientists aim to understand potential evolutionary trajectories and preemptively devise countermeasures. Yet, these very studies pose existential threats if mishandled. A particularly salient instance from history is the work conducted on the poliovirus at MIT in the late 20th century. As the narrative unfolds, this paper seeks to explore the complex interplay between the drive for discovery and the imperative for safety. Central to this discussion is the sudden disbanding of the Department of Applied Biological Sciences at MIT and the unspoken reasons that may have precipitated such a drastic decision. Through this lens, we underscore the profound implications of GoF research on policy, ethics, and institutional decisions.

Keywords: gain-of-function, biosafety, poliovirus, MIT, Department of Applied Biological Sciences, research ethics, vaccine escape mutant, policy implications, scientific discovery, laboratory safety, institutional decisions, global health risks.

Introduction

In the realm of biological research, one methodology has been a consistent topic of debate and scrutiny over the decades: gain-of-function (GoF) studies. At its core, GoF research involves manipulating organisms, often pathogens, to enhance or modify their biological activity, be it their transmissibility, virulence, or resistance to treatments. Such studies can provide invaluable insights, particularly in understanding disease mechanisms, predicting potential future viral mutations, or aiding in the development of new vaccines and treatments.

However, as with any powerful tool, GoF research is accompanied by significant challenges and concerns. The enhanced or modified organisms generated in the laboratory might differ in behavior from their naturally occurring counterparts, leading to uncertainties in predicting their behavior in natural settings. The primary concern that emerges is the potential risk of accidental release of these enhanced pathogens, which could lead to outbreaks or even pandemics, especially if the organism in question is a highly transmissible or virulent one. This risk is amplified when the research is conducted on pathogens for which the global population has little to no immunity, or when the modifications made render current treatments or vaccines less effective.

Given the potential for global ramifications, the importance of GoF research extends beyond the walls of individual laboratories or institutions. It touches upon broader issues of biosafety, bioethics, and public health policy. Laboratories engaged in such research must be equipped with advanced containment facilities, and the scientists involved need specialized training to handle the organisms safely. Moreover, the decision to pursue, fund, or publish GoF research isn't solely a scientific one; it is interwoven

with ethical considerations about the potential consequences, both intended and unintended.

In this context, our exploration into the GoF experiments on the poliovirus at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) during the late 20th century serves as a case study. It provides an opportunity to examine, in detail, the interplay between scientific curiosity, institutional decision-making, and the broader implications for global health. By delving into this specific instance, we aim to shed light on the complexities and challenges inherent in GoF research and the vital importance of approaching such endeavors with caution, transparency, and a commitment to the greater good.

Historical Context

The trajectory of biological research has always been shaped by humanity's quest to understand, manipulate, and, at times, harness the innate characteristics of living organisms. As the tools and techniques of molecular biology and genetics evolved and became more sophisticated, researchers acquired the capacity to make targeted modifications to organisms, leading to the emergence of gain-of-function (GoF) experiments. These experiments, which involve deliberately enhancing or changing an organism's biological properties, have been employed across various biological spheres, from making bacteria more resilient for biotechnological applications to probing the potential future mutations in viruses.

The roots of GoF research can be traced back to the early 20th century, but it was the latter half of the century, particularly with the advent of recombinant DNA technology in the 1970s, that truly marked its proliferation. The Asilomar Conference of 1975 stands as a testament to the scientific community's early recognition of

the challenges posed by this technology. Convened in response to growing concerns about the potential hazards of genetic engineering, the conference laid down guidelines that sought to ensure that recombinant DNA research proceeded with utmost caution.

Parallel to these advancements, the late 20th century was also a pivotal period for poliovirus research. Polio, caused by the poliovirus, had historically been one of the most dreaded diseases, leading to paralysis and, in severe cases, death. The development of vaccines in the 1950s and 1960s, primarily the inactivated poliovirus vaccine by Jonas Salk and the oral polio vaccine by Albert Sabin, marked significant milestones in the fight against polio. By the late 20th century, these vaccines had successfully reduced the global incidence of polio, and there was an optimistic push toward global eradication.

However, this very success posed new challenges for researchers. With the natural circulation of wild polioviruses decreasing due to vaccination campaigns, scientists turned their attention to understanding the intricacies of the virus better, aiming to preempt any hurdles that might stand in the way of complete eradication. The characteristics of vaccine-derived polioviruses, the potential for the virus to mutate and escape immunity conferred by the vaccines, and the long-term strategies to ensure that the virus did not make a comeback became central research themes.

It was within this milieu that the GoF experiments on the poliovirus at MIT took place. The intention to understand the virus better, especially its potential mutations, intersected with the broader and evolving landscape of GoF research, making it a pertinent case study to understand the challenges, decisions, and implications of such high-stakes scientific endeavors.

The Experiment at MIT

Within the hallowed halls of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a significant line of inquiry into the poliovirus was being pursued during the latter part of the 20th century. The spearhead of this effort was Marie Chow, a dedicated researcher whose work on the virus stood at the forefront of the emerging realm of gain-of-function studies.

Marie Chow's Work on Poliovirus: Dr. Marie Chow's primary interest lay in understanding the intricate molecular mechanisms underlying the poliovirus, particularly its antigenic properties. Antigens are parts of pathogens that are recognized by the immune system, and understanding them is crucial for vaccine design and predicting potential challenges in eradicating infectious diseases. Chow's research was driven by the need to delve deeper into these antigenic properties, discerning how slight variations in the virus could potentially lead to resistance against neutralizing antibodies, which are the immune system's primary defense against viruses.

The Controversial Experiment: The study that would later become the center of much discussion was rooted in probing the poliovirus's neutralization sites. In her experiment, Chow and her team employed site-specific mutagenesis methods, a technique that allowed them to make precise, targeted alterations to the viral genome. Their focus was on the VP2 capsid protein of the poliovirus serotype 1, specifically targeting residues at positions 74, 243, and 246. These residues were chosen based on their proximity to previously identified sites on the virus that played a role in neutralization by antibodies, designated as neutralization site 3B.

The goal was to discern if mutations at these sites would impact the virus's ability to be neutralized by antibodies. The results were

enlightening but also concerning. Several of the viable mutant viruses they produced displayed partial or complete resistance to neutralization by the known site 3B neutralizing antibodies. This indicated that these residues did play a role in the formation of the neutralization site and that alterations here could potentially lead to strains of the virus that might escape the neutralizing effects of antibodies developed from existing vaccines.

However, a significant point of note was that not all mutations were viable; some led to non-functional viruses, while others resulted in viruses with compromised growth characteristics. This nuanced finding highlighted the intricate balance that exists in viral genomes, where not all mutations are beneficial for the virus, and some might even be detrimental.

While the scientific merits of Chow's experiment were clear, the potential implications of such GoF studies, especially in the realm of pathogens with pandemic potential, were profound. The possibility of unintentionally creating a vaccine escape mutant, especially in a lab setting with containment facilities that might not be equipped to handle an accidental release of such a mutant, raised critical concerns about biosafety and the broader global health implications.

The Potential Risks

As with any pioneering scientific endeavor, the line between groundbreaking discovery and inadvertent catastrophe is often thin, and understanding the potential risks is paramount. In the context of GoF research on pathogens, especially viruses with known human-to-human transmission like poliovirus, the stakes are undeniably high.

Generating a Vaccine Escape Mutant: Marie Chow's experiments demonstrated the feasibility of introducing specific mutations to the poliovirus that could potentially render it resistant to neutralizing antibodies. This finding, while scientifically significant, raised a grave concern: the generation of a vaccine escape mutant. Such a mutant would be a strain of the virus that has evolved, either naturally or through laboratory manipulations, to overcome the immunity conferred by existing vaccines.

In the real-world context, this would mean that individuals vaccinated against the poliovirus could potentially still be susceptible to infection by this new mutant strain. Such a scenario would jeopardize decades of efforts in polio eradication, potentially leading to new outbreaks in regions previously considered polio-free.

Consequences of Unintended Release: The hypothetical release, accidental or otherwise, of a laboratory-created vaccine escape mutant into the general population is the stuff of epidemiological nightmares. Here are the possible cascading effects:

1. **Resurgence of Infections**: Even in areas with high vaccination rates, the release of a vaccine escape mutant would likely lead to a resurgence of poliovirus infections, given that the existing immunity from vaccinations would no longer be wholly effective.
2. **Overburdened Healthcare Systems**: A sudden spike in polio cases, especially in regions unprepared for such an outbreak, could strain healthcare resources, leading to challenges in patient care, management, and containment.
3. **Societal Panic and Mistrust**: The knowledge that a potentially dangerous virus strain originated from a laboratory setting could sow seeds of mistrust in scientific institutions and research. This could further be exacerbated

by the spread of misinformation, leading to panic and potential reluctance in adopting public health measures.
4. **Economic Impact**: Localized or widespread outbreaks could lead to shutdowns, travel restrictions, and other containment measures that could significantly impact local and global economies.
5. **Reintroduction in Polio-Free Areas**: One of the greatest challenges would be the reintroduction of polio in areas that had been declared polio-free. This would set back global eradication efforts by years, if not decades.
6. **Strain on Vaccine Production**: With a vaccine escape mutant in circulation, there would be an urgent need to develop, test, produce, and distribute a new vaccine – a process that is both time-consuming and resource-intensive.

In essence, while GoF experiments like those conducted by Chow at MIT provide invaluable insights into virus behavior, potential treatment strategies, and vaccine development, they also come with inherent risks. The decision to pursue such studies necessitates a thorough understanding of these risks, combined with rigorous safety protocols, to ensure that the potential benefits to humanity outweigh the possible dangers.

Biosafety Concerns

The field of microbiology, especially when working with pathogenic microorganisms, has long recognized the necessity for rigorous safety standards. These standards, developed over decades of research, ensure that researchers can study these organisms without putting themselves, their colleagues, or the wider community at risk. This becomes even more imperative in the context of GoF experiments, where alterations to an organism may unpredictably enhance its pathogenicity or transmission.

Lab Safety Levels and Their Significance:

1. **Biosafety Level 1 (BSL-1)**: This is the lowest level and is suitable for work with well-characterized agents that do not cause disease in healthy humans. The protocols here are basic and primarily aimed at protecting individuals from exposure.
2. **Biosafety Level 2 (BSL-2)**: Work conducted at this level involves agents that can cause human disease, but pose moderate hazards to personnel and the environment. They typically require enhanced safety measures, like safety cabinets, and protocols to deal with spills or exposure.
3. **Biosafety Level 3 (BSL-3)**: This level is used for pathogens that can cause serious or potentially lethal diseases through inhalation. It demands rigorous controls, such as respiratory protection and strictly controlled access to laboratories.
4. **Biosafety Level 4 (BSL-4)**: This is the highest safety level and is reserved for work with pathogens that pose a high risk of life-threatening disease. BSL-4 labs have the most stringent safety measures, often including full-body positive pressure suits and dedicated air supplies.

Comparison of Safety Protocols:

In the context of Marie Chow's experiment on the poliovirus, the work, as mentioned, was conducted between BSL-1 and BSL-2. Given the potential consequences of a release of a modified poliovirus, especially one with enhanced pathogenic properties or resistance to existing treatments, there's a legitimate question to be raised about whether a higher safety level might have been more appropriate.

When comparing to standard protocols for GoF experiments, especially for pathogens with high consequences, there are certain expectations:

- **Enhanced Containment**: GoF studies on pathogens that can cause significant human disease are typically expected to be carried out in higher biosafety level facilities, often BSL-3 or even BSL-4, depending on the organism and the nature of the modification.
- **Stricter Protocols for Sample Handling**: This might include multiple checks and verifications when accessing samples, stricter protocols for sample destruction after experiments, and rigorous methods for waste disposal.
- **Rigorous Personnel Training**: Researchers involved in GoF experiments should ideally undergo advanced training in handling the specific organisms, ensuring that they are acutely aware of the risks and the necessary precautions.
- **Emergency Response Protocols**: Given the higher stakes, there should be clear and well-rehearsed protocols in place for responding to any breaches, spills, or exposures.

Considering the potential for a modified poliovirus to evade existing vaccines, it becomes imperative to assess whether the safety protocols in place at the time were adequate. While the line between stifling important research and ensuring safety can be thin, the potential consequences of a release underscore the importance of erring on the side of caution.

Ethical Considerations

Scientific research has the potential to unveil revelations that can vastly improve the human condition, but with such transformative power comes the ethical responsibility to ensure that the research does not inadvertently create new threats or exacerbate existing challenges. Especially in the realm of life sciences, where the objects of study are living organisms capable of interacting with

ecosystems in unpredictable ways, the ethical dimensions are multifaceted.

The Balance between Scientific Discovery and Safety:

1. **Driving Forward Knowledge**: Throughout history, human progress has been anchored in our relentless quest for knowledge. Pushing the boundaries of what we know often involves taking calculated risks. The potential rewards, in terms of novel treatments or groundbreaking discoveries, can be vast. However, the pursuit of knowledge, while noble, is not without its challenges, especially when studying potential pathogens.
2. **The Precautionary Principle**: This is a guiding principle in many fields of research, suggesting that if an action or policy has the potential to harm the public or the environment, in the absence of a scientific consensus, the burden of proof falls on those advocating for the action. In the realm of GoF research, this principle would demand rigorous safety measures even in the face of uncertainty about the true risks of the modified organism.

Considerations Regarding the Unintended Consequences of Research:

1. **Unpredictable Outcomes**: Nature, in its complexity, often behaves in ways that are difficult to predict. When introducing changes to an organism, especially at the genetic level, there may be unforeseen consequences not just for the organism itself but for how it interacts with its environment and other organisms.
2. **Long-term Impacts**: Some effects of research might not manifest immediately. A modified organism might initially seem benign or well-contained, but its long-term impact on

ecosystems, or its potential to evolve further, can raise unforeseen challenges.

3. **Moral Responsibility**: There is a profound ethical consideration surrounding the act of creating potentially harmful entities, even in controlled settings. While the intent is usually benevolent, the potential for harm forces researchers to ponder the morality of their actions. Do scientists have the right to create potentially dangerous entities? And if so, what responsibilities come with this?
4. **Transparency and Public Trust**: The scientific community thrives on trust. Trust that researchers are acting in the public's best interest, trust in the rigorousness of peer review, and trust that the potential dangers of research are being responsibly managed. Ethically, there's a strong case to be made for transparency about the potential risks and benefits of research, allowing for an informed public discourse.
5. **Rights of the Affected**: In the case of an unintended release, the potential victims, both immediate and downstream, have rights too. Their right to safety, to be informed, and to reparation in case of harm, are ethical pillars that researchers must consider.

In sum, while the drive to explore, understand, and innovate is at the heart of the scientific endeavor, it comes with an ethical responsibility to navigate the inherent risks cautiously. Balancing the promise of discovery with the potential for harm requires not only scientific rigor but a deep moral introspection, ensuring that the quest for knowledge doesn't inadvertently jeopardize the very world we seek to understand.

The Decision to Disband the Department

The disbanding of a department within a prominent institution like the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) is no trivial matter. The Department of Applied Biological Sciences (ABS) at MIT was well-regarded, boasting a series of significant research undertakings and notable faculty members. Its unexpected dissolution thus took many by surprise, prompting questions and speculations about the underlying reasons.

Overview of the Unexpected Disbanding of the Department of Applied Biological Sciences at MIT:

1. **Chronological Narrative**: The ABS had been a hub of cutting-edge research for several years, playing a pivotal role in advancing various biological disciplines. However, around the early 1990s, the decision to disband the department was suddenly announced, taking many faculty members, students, and stakeholders off guard.
2. **Impact on Faculty and Research**: The disbandment not only affected the administrative structure but also had profound implications for the faculty associated with ABS, many of whom had to transition to other departments or institutions. Moreover, ongoing research projects faced potential disruptions, with some possibly being discontinued or reallocated.
3. **Official Communications**: MIT's official stance on the disbandment was rather general, with limited specific reasons provided. Emphasizing administrative or strategic reshuffling is often the norm in such scenarios, but the lack of detailed explanations led to speculations among affected parties and observers.

Exploration of the Hypothesis Linking the GoF Experiment to the Decision:

1. **The Potential Controversy**: Gain-of-Function (GoF) experiments, by their very nature, come with a set of ethical and safety concerns. Marie Chow's experiment with the poliovirus, wherein specific alterations were made, could be perceived as potentially dangerous, especially if there were lapses in safety protocols or concerns about the unintended consequences of the modified virus.
2. **Connecting the Dots**: The timeline of the experiment and the subsequent decision to disband the department seems coincidental. If higher authorities at MIT, possibly with inputs from external stakeholders, perceived the GoF research as too risky or potentially controversial, it could have influenced the decision to dissolve ABS.
3. **Supporting Evidence and Counterarguments**: While there's a plausible argument linking the GoF experiment to the disbandment, it's essential to acknowledge the broader context. Were there other incidents, administrative challenges, or external pressures facing ABS? The hypothesis about Chow's experiment would need more concrete evidence to be considered definitive.
4. **Broader Implications**: If indeed the GoF experiment was a significant factor in the decision, it underscores the profound implications that ethical and safety concerns in scientific research can have on institutions. It highlights the need for transparent communication, robust oversight, and the ethical considerations scientists must navigate.

In conclusion, while the exact reasons for the disbanding of the ABS remain a blend of official narratives and speculations, the hypothesis linking Marie Chow's experiment to the decision provides a thought-provoking exploration into the broader

dynamics of scientific research, institutional decision-making, and the profound consequences they can carry.

Policy Implications

Scientific progress is a double-edged sword, often advancing knowledge while introducing new complexities and challenges. Gain-of-Function (GoF) experiments are a case in point, offering deep insights into the mechanics of pathogens but posing potential biohazards. The possible linkage between a GoF experiment at MIT and the subsequent disbanding of the Department of Applied Biological Sciences sheds light on the broader policy implications that such research can bring forth.

How Such Incidents Shape Policies at Research Institutions:

1. **Reassessment of Safety Protocols**: High-profile incidents can prompt institutions to revisit their safety guidelines. Institutions may audit their existing facilities and practices, potentially upgrading equipment, enhancing training programs, or re-evaluating the safety levels of various labs to prevent similar incidents.
2. **Ethical Oversight and Scrutiny**: Any controversy surrounding GoF or similar experiments can lead to a heightened focus on ethical oversight. Institutions may establish or strengthen ethics committees, require more rigorous ethical review processes, or mandate wider consultations before approving certain types of research.
3. **Transparency and Communication**: To rebuild trust post-incident, institutions may adopt policies ensuring greater transparency in research undertakings. This might involve better communication with internal and external

stakeholders, more open-access publishing, or public forums to discuss and address concerns.
4. **Crisis Management Protocols**: Events that generate significant public or academic attention can highlight gaps in an institution's crisis management strategy. Institutions may develop or refine protocols for addressing potential controversies, ensuring timely responses, and managing public relations more effectively.

The Importance of Clear Guidelines and Regulations for GoF Research:

1. **Standardizing Research Protocols**: Clear guidelines can ensure that GoF experiments, irrespective of where they are conducted, adhere to a minimum safety and ethical standard. This standardization can reduce the variability in safety protocols and ensure more consistent safeguards.
2. **Balancing Research Freedom and Safety**: While it's crucial to ensure the safety of experiments, it's equally important not to stifle scientific innovation. Well-drafted regulations can strike a balance, allowing researchers the freedom to innovate while ensuring they operate within safe and ethically sound boundaries.
3. **Addressing Grey Areas**: GoF research, like many cutting-edge scientific areas, often operates in grey zones where traditional rules may not apply. Specific guidelines for such research can address these ambiguities, providing clearer direction to researchers.
4. **Public Trust and Support**: In an era of increasing skepticism about science, clear regulations can bolster public trust. When the community knows that rigorous guidelines govern potentially hazardous research, they are more likely to support and trust the institutions conducting such research.

In sum, the potential incident at MIT underscores the critical importance of proactive policy-making in the realm of advanced scientific research. As science continues its relentless march forward, it is imperative for institutional policies to evolve in tandem, ensuring that the quest for knowledge remains both safe and ethically grounded.

Lessons Learned

In the shadow of the unexpected disbanding of the Department of Applied Biological Sciences at MIT, and the potentially linked Gain-of-Function experiment, the academic and scientific communities are left to reflect on the broader lessons that emerge from such an episode. These lessons resonate beyond a single institution, offering insights that can guide the global scientific endeavor.

The Importance of Communication and Consultation Between Researchers and Administrators:

1. **Bridging the Knowledge Gap**: Often, administrators might not be well-versed in the intricate details and implications of specific scientific experiments. Regular communication ensures that administrators are informed about the nature, purpose, and risks associated with ongoing research.
2. **Anticipating Concerns**: Through dialogue, administrators can raise potential external concerns or issues that researchers, deeply engrossed in their work, might overlook. This preemptive approach can help in averting public or internal crises.
3. **Shared Responsibility**: Science is not just the domain of the researcher; it's a collective endeavor. Both researchers and administrators share the responsibility of ensuring that

research is conducted safely, ethically, and in line with the institution's mission and values.
4. **Building Mutual Trust**: Continuous dialogue fosters a sense of trust and mutual respect. When researchers feel that their concerns and needs are understood and valued, they are more likely to approach administrators proactively in times of uncertainty or challenge.

Revisiting Protocols and Policies to Ensure They Are Up-to-Date with Current Scientific Advancements:

1. **Dynamic Nature of Science**: Science is ever-evolving, with new techniques, methodologies, and discoveries emerging at a rapid pace. Policies and protocols must be revisited periodically to ensure they reflect the current state of the scientific field.
2. **Incorporating External Expertise**: Institutions can benefit from external audits or consultations. Independent experts can provide fresh perspectives on safety and ethical protocols, ensuring that they align with global best practices.
3. **Feedback Loop**: Scientists at the ground level can provide valuable feedback on the practicality and relevance of existing protocols. Institutions should create mechanisms for this feedback to be gathered and considered during policy revisions.
4. **Anticipating the Future**: While it's essential to align policies with current scientific practices, forward-thinking institutions will also attempt to forecast future scientific directions and draft policies that are forward-compatible.
5. **Training and Workshops**: As policies and protocols evolve, it's crucial that those involved in research are adequately trained. Regular workshops can ensure that all personnel are updated on the latest guidelines and best practices.

In conclusion, the possible events at MIT provide a poignant reminder of the intricacies and challenges embedded in the scientific enterprise. As the quest for knowledge continues, the lessons drawn from such episodes can act as guiding beacons, ensuring that the path to discovery remains both responsible and enlightened.

Conclusion

In delving into the multifaceted narrative surrounding the disbanding of the Department of Applied Biological Sciences at MIT, and the potentially interconnected Gain-of-Function (GoF) experiment, we unearth critical insights into the broader mechanics of scientific research and institutional decision-making. These insights underscore the intertwined nature of science, ethics, and policy, especially when confronting high-stakes endeavors.

Key Takeaways:

1. **Inherent Risks of GoF Research**: While GoF experiments offer invaluable knowledge, enabling us to predict and potentially counteract future pathogenic threats, they also present inherent and pronounced risks. The case of Marie Chow's work on the poliovirus epitomizes the delicate balance between potential benefits and conceivable hazards.
2. **The Ethical Labyrinth**: Every scientific experiment isn't just a technical endeavor but also an ethical puzzle. The balance between scientific discovery and ensuring safety is pivotal. The potential unintended consequences of research, especially of the magnitude of creating vaccine escape mutants, necessitates deep ethical introspection.

3. **Biosafety Protocols**: The disparity between the biosafety level under which an experiment is conducted and the level it might require underscores the need for a regular re-evaluation of protocols. Ensuring that the highest levels of safety are maintained, particularly for high-risk experiments, is non-negotiable.
4. **Transparency and Communication**: The unexpected closure of the Department of Applied Biological Sciences, though still shrouded in layers of speculation, emphasizes the significance of open dialogue. Transparent communication between researchers, administrators, and other stakeholders is paramount to maintaining trust.
5. **Implications for Policy**: Individual incidents, particularly those with potential global consequences, underscore the urgency for clear guidelines and stringent regulations for GoF and other high-risk research. Institutions must not only develop but rigorously enforce these policies.

A Call to Action:

As science propels us into uncharted territories, the magnitude of its influence on our world amplifies. This expansion necessitates a corresponding evolution in our approaches to biosafety, ethics, and communication. It's imperative that research institutions, policy-makers, and the global scientific community remain acutely aware of the potential ramifications of high-risk experiments. This awareness, coupled with rigorous protocols and a commitment to transparency, can ensure that our pursuit of knowledge remains both enlightened and safe.

In the end, the journey through the corridors of MIT's past serves not as an endpoint but as a beacon, illuminating the path forward, reminding us of the weight of responsibility that accompanies the gift of discovery.

References

1. Casadevall, A., & Imperiale, M. J. (2014). Risks and benefits of gain-of-function experiments with pathogens of pandemic potential, such as influenza virus: a call for a science-based discussion. *mBio*, 5(4), e01730-14.
2. Chow, M., Reynolds, C., Page, H., Zhou, H. (1991). Identification of residues in VP2 that contribute to poliovirus neutralization antigenic site 3B. *Virology*, 184(1):391-6. DOI: 10.1016/0042-6822(91)90856-7
3. Duprex, W. P., Fouchier, R. A., Imperiale, M. J., Lipsitch, M., & Relman, D. A. (2015). Gain-of-function experiments: time for a real debate. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 13(1), 58-64.
4. Evans, N. G. (2013). Great expectations—ethics, avian flu and the value of progress. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 39(4), 209-213.
5. Fouchier, R. A., García-Sastre, A., & Kawaoka, Y. (2013). The pause on avian H5N1 influenza virus transmission research should be ended. *mBio*, 4(6), e00810-13.
6. Lipkin, W. I. (2012). Biocontainment in gain-of-function infectious disease research. *mBio*, 3(5), e00290-12.
7. Osterholm, M. T., & Relman, D. A. (2012). Creating a mammalian-transmissible A/H5N1 influenza virus: social contracts, prudence, and alternative perspectives. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 205(10), 1636-1638.
8. Widnall, S. E., Berchtold, G. A., Essigmann, J. M., Halle, M., Jacoby, H. D., Sharp, P. A., Smith, A. C. (1990). Report on the Closing of the Department of Applied Biological Sciences, MIT.
9. World Health Organization. (2016). Laboratory biosafety manual. World Health Organization.
10. Zhang, Y. Z., & Holmes, E. C. (2020). A genomic perspective on the origin and emergence of SARS-CoV-2. *Cell*, 181(2), 223-227.